

AGENDA and PUBLIC NOTICE

Department of Human Services Institutional Review Board (DHS IRB) Meeting
June 9, 2004, 9 a.m. Room 210

PROTOCOLS FOR REVIEW

- **Marty Mendenhall**, Saybrook Graduate School and Research Center, What are the Benefits of Meditation for Incarcerated Juvenile Delinquents?, DHS IRB # 040260, DHS affiliated agency is the Division of Youth Corrections (DYC). **RISK LEVEL:** ☐ < Minimal risk; ☐ Minimal Risk; ☐ > Minimal risk but with direct benefit to subjects; ☐ > Minimal risk but no direct benefit to subjects.
- **Michael Stevens, M.D.**, Valley Mental Health (VMH), CAFÉ Study Efficacy and Tolerability of Olanzapine, Quetiapine and Risperidone in the Treatment of First Episode Psychosis: a Randomized double Blind 52-Week Comparison, DHS IRB # 020183, DHS affiliated agency is Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health (DSAMH). **Change Request**, DHS affiliated agency is DSAMH. **RISK LEVEL:** ☐ < Minimal risk; ☐ Minimal Risk; ☒ > Minimal risk but with direct benefit to subjects; ☐ > Minimal risk but no direct benefit to subjects. The DHS IRB with Dr. Spencer met and conducted an annual review of this protocol in May 2004. At the IRB meeting Donna Drown advised that due to the increased risk of diabetes they would like to submit a change request and re-consent the five (5) enrollees. The IRB members agreed that would be appropriate. Today we are reviewing that single change.
- **Thomas C. Wallace, Ph.D.**, Wasatch Mental Health, A Research-Based Approach to Short-Term Group Cognitive Therapy in the Treatment of Anxiety and Depression, **New Research**, DHS IRB # 040263, DHS affiliated agency is DSAMH. **Change Request**, DHS affiliated agency is DSAMH. **RISK LEVEL:** ☐ < Minimal risk; ☐ Minimal Risk; ☐ > Minimal risk but with direct benefit to subjects; ☐ > Minimal risk but no direct benefit to subjects.

OTHER BUSINESS

Discussion and identification of pros and cons of whether we should disband the DHS IRB and rely on gatekeeper and local academic institutions' IRB reviews (our FWA expires in December 2004). This would eliminate the duplication and expense of having two separate IRB reviews (academic and DHS) and the need for detailed rulemaking. If the DHS has an in-house federal grant for research, we would have to ask the U of U IRB or other private IRB to conduct that review.